DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 436 CS 506 713

AUTHOR Perse, Elizabeth M.
TITLE Audience Selectivity and Involvement.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (72nd, Washington, DC, August 10-13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Analysis; *Audience Response; Mass Media Effects; Mass Media Use; Programing (Broadcast); Questionnaires; Television Research; Television Surveys; *Television Viewing; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS Cultivation Theory (Television)

ABSTRACT

A study focused on audience selectivity and involvement before and during television exposure. Two types of selectivity were considered: program selection before exposure and changing channels while viewing. The study included four indications of audience involvement: intentionality, or anticipating TV viewing; attention or focused cognitive effort; elaboration or thinking about program content; and distractions while viewing. Questionnaires were completed by 566 respondents who were cable TV subscribers who owned control devices, ranging in age from 15 to 93, from a wide geographic area. Partial correlations indicated that more salient viewing motives are linked to more search for television program information before viewing. Canonical correlation revealed that instrumental use is marked by involvement during exposure. Ritualistic television use is reflected in higher selectivity before and during exposure, but less involvement during exposure. Results indicate that "zapping" is most likely part of a ritualistic viewing pattern. Future research should consider how audience selectivity and involvement influence media effects. (Three tables of data are included and 45 references are attached.) (MG)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth M. Perse
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED310436

# AUDIENCE SELECTIVITY AND INVOLVEMENT

Elizabeth M. Perse

Department of Communication

University of Delaware

Newark, DE 19716

302-451-8041

CS506713

Presented as a top-three paper to the Communication Theory and Methodology Division Association for Journalism and Mass Communication convention, August 1989, Washington, DC. This research was supported by a grant from the University of Delaware College of Arts and Sciences.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# AUDIENCE SELECTIVITY AND INVOLVEMENT


## Abstract

This study extended previous research on audience activity by focusing on audience selectivity and involvement before and during television exposure. Specifically, this study considered two types of selectivity: program selection before exposure and changing channels while viewing. This study included four indications of audience involvement: intentionality, or anticipating television viewing, attention, or focused cognitive effort; elaboration, or thinking about program content; and engaging in distractions while viewing. Because the newer media environment provides more program choice, 342 cable subscribers who also owned remote control devices completed questionnaires. Partial correlations indicated that more salient viewing motives are linked to more search for television program information before viewing. Canonical correlation revealed that instrumental use is marked by involvement during exposure. Ritualistic television use is reflected in higher selectivity before and during exposure, but less involvement during exposure. The discussion focuses on implications of these findings for gratification-seeking activity and media effects.

## AUDIENCE SELECTIVITY AND INVOLVEMENT

Uses and gratifications research looks to the audience to understand media uses and effects because people are seen as active in choosing and using media and their content. Because research showed that media use can be more or less active, Blumler (1979) suggested that audience activity is an important variable in uses and gratifications. Recent writings have described dimensions of audience activity (Levy & Windahl, 1984, 1985) and shown that television viewing motives and attitudes explain variations in activity and news and soap opera viewing outcomes (Perse & Rubin, 1988; Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b).

Newer television technologies provide additional opportunity to understand audience activity because the current media environment allows people to be more active before and during television exposure. Multichannel cable television and remote control devices give audience members greater option to choose programs and reevaluate their choices (e.g., Heeter & Greenberg, 1988a; Walker, 1988).

This study focused on two dimensions of audience activity, selectivity and involvement, and was designed to extend understanding of the linkages between dimensions of activity. Specifically, I expected that television viewing motives and attitudes would help explain how actively people select programs and become involved with program content before and during television exposure.

### Audience Activity

Based on Blumler (1979), uses and gratifications considers audience activity an important variable. Audience activity describes how intentionally and purposely people select, attend to, and use media and their content. Levy and Windahl (1984, 1985) proposed a two-dimensional typology of audience activity. The first dimension is qualitative and describes types of activity: selectivity, or how purposely people chose media and their content; involvement, or the degree to which people personally relate to media content; and utility, or how useful media and their content are to audience members. The second dimension is temporal and describes activity as occurring before, during, and after exposure.

Research has begun to explore the relationships among activity dimensions. Levy and Windahl (1984) found that activity varied across dimensions. Rubin and Perse (1987a, 1987b) observed that, for the most part, activity measures were positively related. That is, activity was somewhat consistent across qualitative and temporal dimensions in soap opera and local news viewing. Most recently, Levy (1987) found only modest relationships between dimensions of activity in VCR users. Interitem correlations were larger within qualitative dimensions than within temporal dimensions.

Most importantly, viewing motives, or gratifications sought, explain variations in activity. Levy and Windahl (1984) observed that more salient viewing motives were linked to higher levels of activity before watching the news. The multivariate relationship between motives, attitudes, and activity reinforced the importance of motivation to activity (Rubin &

Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Seeking information and exciting entertainment from local news were related to more intentional planning and cognitive involvement with the content. On the other hand, watching local news to pass time was linked to less selective news behaviors and less attention to the programs (Rubin & Perse, 1987b).

Audience activity is an important concept in media uses and gratifications because activity influences the gratifications viewers receive from television exposure (Levy & Windahl, 1984). Soap opera viewing outcomes have also been explained by variations in motivation, attitudes, and activity. Voyeuristic viewing motives, higher levels of perceived realism, and higher attention levels were related to parasocial interaction with a favorite soap opera character (Rubin & Perse, 1987a). Watching soap operas for social utility, lower levels of perceived realism, and less attention were linked to discussing soap operas after exposure (Rubin & Perse, 1987a). And, soap opera satisfaction was explained by seeking exciting entertainment and relaxation and higher levels of attention and parasocial interaction (Perse & Rubin, 1988).

Research on audience activity has been somewhat limited, though. Most research has considered only the qualitative dimension of activity (cf. Levy, 1987). Levy and Windahl (1985) pointed out that systematic and in-depth analysis of activity types across time is necessary for clearer understanding of the concept. This study focused on two types of audience activity, selectivity and involvement, both before and during television exposure.

Selectivity

Selectivity has two related meanings in research. First, selectivity is preference for certain content that limits exposure to other content (Levy & Windahl, 1984, 1985; Rubin & Perse, 1987b). For example, instrumental television use, or watching television for informational reasons, is highly selective and linked to watching only news, documentaries, and talk programs (Rubin, 1984). Ritualistic use, or watching for many different reasons, especially out of habit or to pass time, is nonselective that includes exposure to a variety of different program types (Rubin, 1984).

Although there is evidence that program selection may be nonselective and based on audience availability and inheritance effects (Webster & Wakshlag, 1983), researchers have shown that audience selectivity is a variable explained by viewing motives and attitudes. For example, selective news use has been explained by lower levels of pass-time viewing motives and perceived news realism, and more intention to watch news (Rubin & Perse, 1987b).

Another way to consider selectivity is as selective exposure, or the behaviors that lead to program selection (Zillmann & Bryant, 1985). Two sets of selectivity behaviors are orienting search and reevaluation (Heeter, 1985; Heeter & Greenberg, 1988b).

The orienting search occurs before television exposure. It is the set of behaviors that lead to awareness of program alternatives. There are two ways to become aware of program offerings, through guide use and by

sampling the programs themselves. Reevaluation occurs during television exposure. It is the critical analysis of whether to continue watching a program (Heeter, 1985; Heeter & Greenberg, 1988b). Reevaluation has three potential outcomes, continued program exposure, channel switching, or ending television exposure.

Little research has investigated the links between program selection, channel changing, viewing motives, and attitudes. Eastman and Gantz (1983) found that heavier viewers were more likely to use TV Guide and newspaper supplements. Heeter (1985) found that habitual viewing was unrelated to guide use and related negatively to changing channels during viewing.

Newer media technologies, however, influence program selection and channel changing. The multichannel cable environment increases the likelihood that program alternatives will be less familiar because there are more channels to sample. Cable subscribers watch more different channels than nonsubscribers (Ainslie, 1988; Webster, 1983) and are more likely to use program guides (Greenberg, Heeter, D'Alessio, & Sipes, 1988; Heeter & Baldwin, 1988). Cable subscribers are also more likely to sample channels in orienting searches (Heeter & Greenberg, 1988b).

The remote control eases both program sampling and reevaluation because viewers can change channels with less effort. Remote control owners watch more different channels (Ainslie, 1988) and are more likely to scan channels in orienting searches (Heeter & Greenberg, 1988b). Remote controls have been associated with more overall channel changing, especially during shows (Heeter & Baldwin, 1988) and more extensive reevaluation (Heeter, 1985).

## Involvement

Although involvement has a variety of meanings to communication researchers (see Salmon, 1986 for a summary), involvement as audience activity is a sense that media content is personally important and reflects personal participation with content (Krugman, 1966; Levy & Windahl, 1985; Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Research has considered several indications of the involvement dimension of audience activity.

Before exposure, involvement is anticipation of media content reflected in intentionality and belief that the content is important (Levy & Windahl, 1984, 1985; Rubin & Perse, 1987b). Research has identified links between intentionality and viewing motives, attitudes, and other viewing activities. Levy and Windahl (1984) found that intentionality was related positively to all news viewing motives. Rubin and Perse (1987a, 1987b) observed that intentionality was positively related to seeking entertainment and information from local news and soap operas and higher levels of news importance and perceived news realism, but negatively related to watching to pass time. Further, intentionality was related positively to higher levels of cognitive involvement during news and soap opera exposure.

During exposure involvement is reflected in activities that are oriented toward program content--attention and elaboration. Engaging in distracting activities has been considered as a signal of less attention. Attention to soap operas was linked to higher levels of entertainment and

informational viewing motives, importance, and perceived realism (Rubin & Perse, 1987a). During exposure involvement is also reflected in elaboration, or thinking about program content. Cognitive involvement with news content was predicted by informational viewing motives and higher news realism (Rubin & Perse, 1987b). On the other hand, distracting activities have been related to viewing news and soap operas to pass time and lower levels of perceived importance and realism of the programs (Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b).

## Research Model

This study was designed to increase understanding of two orientations of audience activity, selectivity and involvement, before and during exposure. Selectivity before exposure was operationalized as deliberate search for information about programs. During exposure, selectivity was channel switching or reevaluation of programs. Involvement had four operationalizations. Before exposure involvement was intentionality, or anticipation. During exposure, involvement was reflected in greater cognitive activity, attention and elaboration, and in less cognitive activity, engaging in distracting behaviors while viewing.

This study was based on an instrumental model of audience activity that proposes that viewing motives and attitudes influence audience selectivity and involvement (Rubin, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987b). Specifically, more instrumental television use, or viewing for informational reasons and higher levels of television's perceived importance and realism, are linked to more selectivity and involvement. On the other hand, a more ritualistic television use, or viewing out of habit or to pass time, and lower levels of television's perceived importance and realism, would be linked to less selectivity and involvement.

Thus, I expected that [a] instrumental viewing motives, such as viewing for information, and [b] television attitudes, higher levels of television, affinity, or a sense that television is important, and perceived realism, or beliefs that television content is an accurate portrayal of the world, would be linked to more [c] program selection and [d] intentional anticipation before exposure and to lower levels of [e] channel switching, and [f] distracting behaviors, and higher levels of [g] attention and [h] cognitive activity.

# Method

## Procedure and Sample

Trained research assistants enrolled in a research methods class in Spring 1988 were given course credit for collecting the data for this study. The assistants were trained in questionnaire administration and ethics and instructed to recruit adults in six age and gender quotas (male and female 18-34, 35-49, and 50 and older) to complete questionnaires. A total of 566 questionnaires were completed.

The sample was 48.8% male and ranged in age from 15 to 93 ($M$ = 40.18, $SD$ = 15.93). Respondents were drawn from a wide geographic area: 232 different zipcodes were represented. The sample was somewhat well educated. Overall, 18.7% were high-school graduates, 31.4% had attended

college, 30.7% were college graduates, and 14.0% had attended graduate school. Average occupational level was 3.15 (SD = 1.56) where 1 = professional and 7 = unskilled labor.

The average respondent watched an estimated 2.78 hours of television a day (SD = 1.66). Overall, 67.6% of the sample subscribed to cable; 45.8% subscribed to paycable services; and 75.4% owned a remote control.

## Viewing Motives

Respondents compared 27 statements to their own reasons for watching television (5 = exactly, 1 = not at all). Because viewing motives are correlated (Rubin, 1984), the statements were submitted to principal factor analysis with oblique rotation (SPSS, 1986). The criteria for a factor to be retained were an eigenvalue greater than 1.0 and three primary loadings of .45 with no secondary loadings greater than .25. Four television viewing motives that accounted for 47.2% of the total variance were identified. The factor analysis is summarized in Table 1.

---

Table 1 about here

---

Factor 1, Habit-Pass Time (eigenvalue = 7.67), accounted for 21.3% of the variance and included four reasons for watching television out of habit and when there is nothing better to do. Factor 2, Entertainment (eigenvalue = 2.46), accounted for 7.3% of the variance and was made up of three statements reflecting enjoyment of television. Factor 3, Information (eigenvalue = 1.54), accounted for 6.5% of the variance. This factor included three statements about watching television to learn. Factor 4, Relaxation (eigenvalue = 1.09) accounted for 7.6% of the variance and reflected using television to relax and rest. Subsequent analyses used viewing motive factor scores constructed using the regression method (SPSS, 1986).

## Television Attitudes

This study included two attitudes about television. Affinity reflects how important respondents feel television is. Perceived realism indicates how true-to-life television content is seen.

Two scales to measure affinity and perceived realism were drawn from previous research (Rubin, 1983; Rubin & Perse, 1987a). Respondents indicated their agreement (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree) with the 11 statements. Responses were averaged to created affinity and perceived realism scores. Affinity scores ranged from 1.00 to 4.00 (M = 1.84, SD = 0.69, Cronbach alpha = .81). Perceived realism scores ranged from 1.00 to 4.17 (M = 2.37, SD = 0.62, Cronbach alpha = .78).

## Selectivity

Two selectivity measures assessed program selection before exposure and channel changing during television exposure. To measure program selection, respondents indicated how often (5 = very often, 1 = never) they used the eight information sources when deciding programs to watch: weekly

newspaper television supplement, daily newspaper television program listings, TV Guide, cable company guides, electronic program guide on cable system, other program guides, on-air promotions, and other people's advice (Gantz & Eastman, 1983; Greenberg, Srigley, Baldwin, & Heeter, 1988). Guide use was averaged to created program selection scores. Program selection scores ranged from 1.00 to 5.00 (M = 2.42, SD = 0.61, Cronbach alpha = .67).

To measure selectivity during exposure, or channel changing, respondents marked when they changed television channels while they watched. Of the total sample, 1.8% never changed (coded = 0), 31.3% changed between programs (1), 39.9% changed when commercials came on (2), 26.9% changed in the middle of shows--even when commercial weren't on (3).

Involvement

This study concerned four types of involvement; intentionality, or a sense of anticipation before exposure; attention, or focused cognitive effort directed toward television content; elaboration, or thinking about television content; and engaging in distracting behaviors while viewing as an indication of less involvement.

To assess intentionality, or involvement before exposure, respondents indicated their agreement (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree) with five statements drawn from previous research that concerned planning exposure and looking forward to watching a favorite program (Levy & Windahl, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Responses were averaged. Intentionality scores ranged from 1.00 to 5.00 (M = 2.81, SD = 0.79, Cronbach alpha = 86). .pa

To measure attention to program content, respondents marked their agreement (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree) with seven statements drawn from previous research that reflected concentration and attention to program content (Cegala, 1981; Rouner, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987a; Rubin, Perse, & Taylor, 1988). Responses were averaged to create attention scores. Attention scores ranged from 1.00 to 4.71 (M = 2.73, SD = 0.66, Cronbach alpha = 83).

To measure elaboration, or thinking about program content, respondents expressed their agreement (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree) with four statements reflecting thinking (a) "about the program over and over," (b) "about what the program means to me and my family, " (c) "about how the program relates to other things I know," and (d) "about what the programs mean to other people." Responses were averaged. Elaboration scores ranged from 1.00 to 4.50 (M = 2.41, SD = 0.69, Cronbach alpha = 79).

To assess distractions while viewing, respondents indicated how often (5 = very often, 1 = never) they engaged in nine coviewing activities drawn from previous research (Levy & Windahl, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987a, 1987b). Responses were averaged to create distraction scores. Distractions ranged from 1.00 to 5.00 (M = 2.82, SD = 0.63, Cronbach alpha = .75).

## The Subsample

Because this study considered audience selectivity and involvement in the newer media environment, only respondents who subscribed to cable and owned a remote control device were included in further analysis. Of the sample, 60.4% ($n$ = 342) subscribed to cable and owned a remote control device. This group differed only slightly from the overall sample. The more technological group had higher status occupations ($M$ = 3.03, $SD$ = 1.48) than the less technological group ($M$ = 3.31, $SD$ = 1.66, $t(532) = 2.07$, $p < .05$). The cable/remote group was more likely to engage in program selection before viewing ($M$ = 2.50, $SD$ = 0.66) than the nonsubscribers/nonowners ($M$ = 2.30, $SD$ = 0.51, $t(546) = 3.94$, $p < .001$). The cable/remote control group was more likely to watch television for entertainment reasons ($M$ = 3.40, $SD$ = 0.70) than the other group ($M$ = 3.26, $SD$ = 0.78, $t(559) = 2.22$, $p < .05$. Finally, the cable/remote group were more likely to change channels while viewing television ($M$ = 2.03, $SD$ = 1.76) than the others ($M$ = 1.76, $SD$ = 0.81, $t(563) = 4.03$, $p < .001$).

## Statistical Analyses

Following scale construction, there were two stages to data analysis. First, partial correlations (controlling for age, sex, education, and occupational level) identified the univariate relationships between the variables of the study. Second, canonical correlation analysis tested the multivariate link between the set of viewing motives and attitudes and the set of selectivity and involvement activities before and during television exposure. Because multicollinearity can affect canonical weights, the discussion will focus on the structure coefficients or canonical loadings (Levine, 1977). Because less substantial loadings may be unstable, only variables with canonical loadings greater than .30 were interpreted (Lambert & Durand, 1975). Redundancy coefficients, which indicate the amount of variance that each set can explain in the other set, are also reported.

# Results

## Correlates of Activity

The first stage of the analysis was to investigate the univariate relationships between the variables of the investigation. The partial correlations (controlling for age, sex, education, and occupational level) are presented in Table 2.

---

Table 2 about here

---

The pattern of partial correlations expands the view of instrumental-ritualistic uses uncovered by previous research (Rubin, 1984; Rubin & Perse, 1987b). The habit-pass time viewing motive is related positively to affinity ($r$ = .35, $p < .001$), and distractions ($r$ = .31, $p < .001$). Viewing for informational reasons, on the other hand, is related positively to affinity ($r$ = .20, $p < .001$), perceived realism ($r$ = .40, $p < .001$), attention ($r$ = .24, $p < .001$), and elaboration ($r$ = .53, $p < .001$).

Entertainment is related positively to affinity ($r$ = .36, $p$ < .001), perceived realism ($r$ = .15, $p$ < .05), intentionality ($r$ = .40, $p$ < .001), attention ($r$ = .21, $p$ < .001), and elaboration ($r$ = .15, $p$ < .05). Relaxation is related positively to affinity ($r$ = .27, $p$ < .001), perceived realism ($r$ = .15, $p$ < .05), intentionality ($r$ = .26, $p$ < .001), distractions ($r$ = .14, $p$ < .05), and elaboration ($r$ = .19, $p$ < .01).

All television viewing motives are related positively to preexposure activity. Program selection is related positively to all viewing motives: Habit Pass Time ($r$ = .35, $p$ < .001), Entertainment ($r$ = .29, $p$ < .001), Information ($r$ = .32, $p$ <.001), and Relaxation ($r$ = .27, $p$ < .001). Intentionality is also related positively to all viewing motives: Habit Pass Time ($r$ = .25, $p$ < .001), Entertainment ($r$ = .40, $p$ < .001), Information ($r$ = .21, $p$ <.001), and Relaxation ($r$ = .26, $p$ < .001). Channel changing was related significantly only to attention; higher levels of attention were associated with lower levels of channel changing ($r$ = .25, $p$ < .001).

Canonical Analysis of Activity

This study concerned the influences of television viewing motives and attitudes on audience selectivity and involvement. Canonical correlation assessed the relationship between the set of viewing motives and attitudes and the set of audience activity. Table 3 summarizes the canonical analysis. Three significant roots were identified.

---

Table 3 about here

---

The first root ($R_c$ = .74, $p$ < .001) explained 55.0% of the variance in common between the canonical variates. The first set includes positive loadings of all viewing motives and attitudes. The second set is marked by positive loadings of program selection, intentionality, attention, and elaboration. This root shows that more salient viewing motives and higher levels of television affinity and perceived realism are linked to more selectivity before exposure and higher levels of involvement while watching television.

The second root ($R_c$ = .51, $p$ < .001) explained 25.8% of the variance in common between the canonical variates. The first set contains negative loadings of Entertainment and affinity and a positive loading of Information. The second set has a negative loading of intentionality and a positive loading of elaboration. This root reflects the more instrumental use of television. Viewing for information reasons, but not for entertainment reasons, and lower levels of television affinity are associated with higher levels of elaboration during exposure and lower levels of intentionality before viewing.

The third root ($R_c$ = .45, $p$ < .001) explained 19.8% of the variance in common between the canonical variates. The first set is marked by positive loadings of Habit-Pass Time and Relaxation viewing motives and a negative loading of perceived realism. The second set features positive loadings of program selection, channel changing, and distractions, and negative loadings of attention and elaboration. This root reflects a more

ritualistic use of television. Viewing out of habit, to pass time, or to relax, and lower levels of perceived realism are linked to more selectivity before and during viewing, but lower levels of involvement while viewing.

## Discussion

Cable and remote controls don't change the basic uses of television. The ritualistic-instrumental model describes the viewing patterns in a multichannel, easier channel changing media environment. The results of this study, though, give new information about the place of selectivity and involvement in television viewing patterns.

Ritualistic use is marked by higher selectivity before and during television exposure, but lower levels of involvement while viewing. Habit-pass time and relaxation viewing motives focus less on television content and more on the television medium (Rubin, 1984). Perhaps medium-centered, process gratifications can be fulfilled with lower levels of activity during exposure (Cutler & Danowski, 1980).

Instrumental use features less involvement before exposure, but higher involvement while viewing. Instrumental television use focuses on exposure to only specific news and public affairs programs (Rubin, 1984). Because those programs are regularly scheduled, it is not surprising that program selection is unrelated to instrumental use. Instrumental use's focus on television content is reflected in higher involvement during exposure. The lower levels of involvement prior to viewing may reflect the delayed gratifications received from news viewing (Schramm, 1949).

The results of this study reinforce the basic uses and gratifications assumption that media use is gratification-seeking activity (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974). More salient viewing motives are linked to higher levels of preexposure activity: program selection and anticipation. These findings suggest that the explanatory power of expectancy-value research might improve if the focus expanded beyond media exposure and included measures of program selection and intention (Babrow & Swanson, 1988; Palmgreen & Rayburn, 1985).

This study's findings affirm the value of the Levy-Windahl audience activity typology (Levy & Windahl, 1985). It is useful to consider activity two-dimensional. This study found that audience activity was not necessarily consistent across time. Further, there are distinctions between selectivity and involvement. Higher channel changing levels are linked to lower levels of attention and elaboration. Future research should consider the utility and postexposure dimensions of activity to uncover the relationships between elements of the entire typology (Palmgreen, 1984).

Although program selection was not very high in this sample, channel changing was substantial. Less than a third of the sample reported to change channels only between programs. Almost 40% zapped, or changed channels during commercials. Understanding zapping is a high priority for industry, because zappers tune out high-cost commercials (Kaplan, 1985). Earlier research has identified zapping patterns (Kaplan, 1985) and personal characteristics of zappers (Heeter & Greenberg, 1985).

The results of this study point out that zapping is most likely part of a ritualistic viewing pattern. That is, channel changing is linked to viewing television out of habit or to pass time, less attention to programs, and engaging in many distractions while viewing. Zapping, then, may not be so serious a problem. Advertisers may be losing those viewers least likely to be attentive to their commercials. In this sample, more instrumental, content-oriented use is unrelated to channel changing. The sample was not random, however, so results should be generalized with caution.

These findings about channel changing also have theoretical implications. First, program choice models may be less accurate as inheritance effects decrease (Walker, 1988). Second, evidence of increased channel changing challenges cultivation writers' assumption of nonselective television exposure (e.g., Gerbner & Gross, 1976). Future cultivation research should consider how increased selectivity influences exposure to primetime television content and cultivation effects (Bryant, 1986).

Research needs to know more about channel changing and program reevaluation. Future research should consider social influences on selectivity. Do group and family viewing situations reduce channel changing (Lull, 1982; Webster & Wakshlag, 1982). Heeter (1985) found that cognitive novelty seeking was related to program selectivity and channel changing. Additional research should consider how other personality traits, such as sensation seeking (Zuckerman, Kolin, Price, and Zoob, 1964) and need for cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982) influence channel changing.

Most importantly, future research should consider how audience selectivity and involvement influence media effects. Recent research suggests that more active, instrumental television use is associated with media effects, such as parasocial interaction, cultivation, and program satisfaction (Perse, 1986; Perse & Rubin, 1988; Rubin, Perse, & Powell, 1985). These results are explained largely because involvement enhances media effects (e.g., Salmon, 1986).

Although Rubin and Perse (1987b) argue that activity is a catalyst to effects, increased channel changing coupled with lower attention may lessen media effects. It may be that the higher levels of channel changing may be a sign of an obstinate audience not likely to be affected by media content (Bauer, 1964).

References

Ainslie, P. (1988, September). Confronting a nation of grazers. Channels: The business of communications, pp. 54-62.

Babrow, A. S., & Swanson, D. L. (1988). Disentangling antecedents of audience exposure levels: Extending expectancy-value analyses of gratifications sought from television news. Communication Monographs, 55, 1-21.

Bauer, R. A. (1964). The obstinate audience: The influence process from the point of view of social communication. American Psychologist, 19, 319-328.

Blumler, J. G. (1979). The role of theory in uses and gratifications studies. Communication Research, 6, 9-36.

Bryant, J. (1986). The road most traveled: Yet another cultivation critique. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30, 231-244.

Cacioppo, J. T., & Petty, R. E. (1982). The need for cognition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 116-131.

Cegala, D. J. (1981). Interaction involvement: A cognitive dimension of communicative competence. Communication Education, 30, 109-121.

Cutler, N., & Danowski, J. (1980). Process gratification in aging cohorts. Journalism Quarterly, 57, 269-277.

Gantz, W., & Eastman, S. T. (1983). Viewer uses of promotional media to find out about television programs. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 27, 269-277.

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976). Living with television: The violence profile. Journal of Communication, 26(2), 172-199.

Greenberg, B. S., Heeter, C., D'Alessio, D., & Sipes, S. (1988). Cable and noncable viewing style comparisons. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 207-225). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Greenberg, B. S., Srigley, R., Baldwin, T. F., & Heeter, C. (1988). Free system-specific cable guides as an incentive. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 264-288). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heeter, C. (1985). Program selection with abundance of choice: A process model. Human Communication Research, 12, 126-152.

Heeter, C., & Baldwin, T. F. (1988). Channel type and viewing styles. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 167-176). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heeter, C. & Greenberg, B. S. (1988a). Cableviewing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Heeter, C., & Greenberg, B. S. (1988b). A theoretical overview of the program choice process. In C. Heeter & B. S. Greenberg (Eds.), Cableviewing (pp. 33-50). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kaplan, B. M. (1985). Zapping--the real issue is communication. Journal of Advertising Research, 25(2), 9-12.

Katz, E., Blumler, J. G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research (pp. 19-32). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Krugman, H. E. (1966). The measurement of advertising involvement. Public Opinion Quarterly, 30, 583-596.

Lambert, Z. V., & Durand, R. M. (1975). Some precautions in using canonical analysis. Journal of Marketing Research, 12, 468-475.

Levine, M. S. (1977). Canonical analysis and factor comparison. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Levy, M. R. (1987). VCR use and the concept of audience activity. Communication Quarterly, 35, 267-275.

Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1984). Audience activity and gratifications: A conceptual clarification and exploration. Communication Research, 11, 51-78.

Levy, M. R., & Windahl, S. (1985). The concept of audience activity. In K. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media gratifications research: Current perspectives (pp. 109-122). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Lull, J. (1982). How families select television programs: A mass-observational study. Journal of Broadcasting, 26, 801-811.

Palmgreen, P. (1984). Uses and gratifications: A theoretical perspective. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8, (pp. 20-55). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Palmgreen, P., & Rayburn, J. D. (1985). An expectancy-value approach to media gratifications. InK. E. Rosengren, L. A. Wenner, & P. Palmgreen (Eds.), Media gratifications research (pp. 61-72). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Perse, E. M. (1986). Soap opera viewing patterns of college students and cultivation. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30, 175-193.

Perse, E. M., & Rubin, A. M. (1988). Audience activity and satisfaction with favorite television soap opera. Journalism Quarterly, 65, 368-375.

Rouner, D. (1984). Active television viewing and the cultivation hypothesis. Journalism Quarterly, 61, 168-174.

Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 37-51.

Rubin, A. M. (1984). ritualized and instrumental television viewing. Journal of Communication, 34(3), 67-77.

Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987a). Audience activity and soap opera involvement: A uses and effects investigation. Human Communication Research, 14, 246-268.

Rubin, A. M., & Perse, E. M. (1987b). Audience activity and television news gratifications. Communication Research, 14, 58-84.

Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Powell, R. A. (1985). Loneliness, parasocial interaction, and local television news viewing. Human Communication Research, 12, 155-180.

Rubin, A. M., Perse, E. M., & Taylor, D. S. (1988). A methodological investigation of cultivation. Communication Research, 15, 107-134.

Salmon, C. T. (1986). Perspectives on involvement in consumer and communication research. In B. Dervin & M. J. Voigt (Eds.), Progress in communication sciences (Vol. 7, pp. 243-268). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Schramm, W. (1949). The nature of news. Journalism Quarterly, 26, 259-269.

SPSS, Inc. (1986). SPSSX user's guide (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Walker, J. R. (1988). Inheritance effects in the new media environment. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 32, 391-401.

Webster, J. G. (1983). The impact of cable and pay cable television on local station audiences. Journal of Broadcasting, 27, 119-126.

Webster, J. G., &Wakshlag, J. J. (1982). The impact of group viewing on patterns of television program choice. Journal of Broadcasting, 26, 445-455.

Webster, J. G., & Wakshlag, J. J. (1983). A theory of television program choice. Communication Research, 10, 430-446.

Zillmann, D., & Bryant, J. (1985). Selective-exposure phenomena. In D. Zillmann & J. Bryant (Eds.), Selective exposure to communication (pp. 1-10). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Zuckerman, M., Kolin, E. A.,, Price, L., & Zoob, I. (1964). Development of a sensation-seeking scale. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 477-482.

Table 1

Television Viewing Motives Oblique Factor Solution

| I watch television . . . | Habit | Entertain | Inform | Relax |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Just because it's on (2.43, 1.13) | .54 | -.08 | .03 | .04 |
| Because it's a habit, just something I do (2.46, 1.15) | .53 | .12 | .01 | .11 |
| Because it gives me something to do to occupy my time (2.42, 1.11) | .50 | .18 | -.11 | -.06 |
| When I have nothing better to do (2.97, 1.19) | .50 | .08 | -.19 | -.10 |
| Because it passes the time away, particularly when I'm bored (2.73, 1.22) | .48 | .18 | .03 | .10 |
| Because it's enjoyable (3.40, 0.86) | .02 | .73 | .05 | .07 |
| Because it entertains me (3.57, 0.87) | -.08 | .70 | -.04 | .07 |
| Because it amuses me (3.02, 0.90) | .02 | .60 | .14 | .07 |
| So I can learn how to do things I haven't done before (2.35, 1.11) | -.01 | .04 | .68 | -.04 |
| So I can learn about what could happen to me (2.08, 1.00) | .00 | -.03 | .68 | .01 |
| Because it helps me learn things about myself and others (2.71, 1.10) | -.08 | .09 | .65 | -.05 |
| Because it allows me to unwind (3.02, 1.09) | -.09 | .01 | -.04 | .84 |
| Because it relaxes me (3.20, 1.01) | -.06 | .13 | .02 | .76 |
| So I can forget about work or other things (2.64, 1.24) | .14 | -.06 | -.11 | .53 |
| Because it's a pleasant rest (2.95, 1.00) | .05 | .25 | .03 | .49 |
| Eigenvalue | 7.67 | 2.45 | 1.54 | 1.09 |
| Variance Explained | 7.8 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 7.6 |
| Cronbach Alpha | .83 | .75 | .74 | .77 |
| Mean | 2.60 | 3.34 | 2.37 | 2.95 |
| Standard Deviation | .89 | .74 | .87 | .85 |

Note. Numbers in parantheses are item means and standard deviations. N = 534.

Table 2

Partial Correlation Matrix

| | HPT | ENT | INF | RLX | AFF | REAL | PS | CHN | INT | ATT | DIS | ELB |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entertainment | .20 | --- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Information | -.01 | .15 | --- | | | | | | | | | |
| Relaxation | .40 | .36 | .22 | --- | | | | | | | | |
| Affinity | .35 | .36 | .20 | .27 | --- | | | | | | | |
| Perceived Realism | .09 | .15 | .40 | .15 | .44 | --- | | | | | | |
| Program Selection | .35 | .29 | .32 | .27 | .26 | .24 | --- | | | | | |
| Channel Changing | .08 | .02 | .00 | .01 | -.09 | -.04 | -.06 | --- | | | | |
| Intentionality | .25 | .40 | .21 | .26 | .52 | .23 | .44 | -.08 | --- | | | |
| Attention | -.06 | .21 | .24 | .05 | .29 | .33 | .14 | -.25 | .28 | --- | | |
| Distractions | .31 | -.03 | .17 | .14 | .05 | .06 | .31 | .07 | .12 | -.17 | --- | |
| Elaboration | .06 | .15 | .53 | .19 | .29 | .54 | .26 | -.10 | .26 | .52 | .00 | --- |

Note. Reported are fourth-order partial correlations, controlling for age, gender, education, and occupational level.

$r = .13$, $p < .05$, $r = .17$, $p < .01$, $r = .20$, $p < .001$.

Table 3

Canonical Correlation:

Viewing Motives and Attitudes with Selectivity and Involvement

| | Root 1 | Root 2 | Root 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Set 1: Antecedents | | | |
| Viewing Motives | | | |
| Habit-Pass Time | .40 | -.12 | .84 |
| Entertainment | .47 | -.63 | .10 |
| Information | .78 | .37 | -.15 |
| Relaxation | .48 | -.05 | .41 |
| Attitudes | | | |
| Affinity | .70 | -.56 | -.08 |
| Perceived Realism | .73 | .16 | -.44 |
| Redundancy | [.20] | [.04] | [.04] |
| Set 2: Outcomes | | | |
| Selectivity | | | |
| Program Selection | .67 | -.07 | .56 |
| Channel Changing | -.03 | .13 | .35 |
| Involvement | | | |
| Intentionality | .66 | -.70 | .11 |
| Attention | .48 | -.27 | -.55 |
| Distractions | .24 | .29 | .64 |
| Elaboration | .83 | .32 | -.44 |
| Redundancy | [.17] | [.03] | [.04] |

Note. Root 1: $\underline{R}c = .74$, $\underline{R}c^2 = .55$, Bartlett's chi-square (36, $\underline{N} = 280$) = 369.59, $\underline{p} < .001$. Root 2: $\underline{R}c = .51$, $\underline{R}c^2 = .26$, Bartlett's chi-square (25, $\underline{N} = 280$) = 152.00, $\underline{p} < .001$. Root 1: $\underline{R}c = .45$, $\underline{R}c^2 = .20$, Bartlett's chi-square (16, $\underline{N} = 280$) = 70.53, $\underline{p} < .001$.